		YAVA MI COUNTY, ARIZONA
1	Larry A. Hammond, 004049 Anne M. Chapman, 025965	2010 JUL 23 AM 8: 30
2	OSBORN MALEDON, P.A.	JEANNE HICKS. CLERK
3	2929 N. Central Avenue, 21st Floor Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2793	•
4	(602) 640-9000	BY: B. Chamberlain
5	lhammond@omlaw.com achapman@omlaw.com	
6		
7	John M. Sears, 005617 P.O. Box 4080	
8	Prescott, Arizona 86302	
9	(928) 778-5208 John.Sears@azbar.org	
10	John Scarswazuar.org	
11	Attorneys for Defendant	
12	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF YAVAPAI	
13	IN AND FOR THE C	COUNTION TAVALAL
14	STATE OF ARIZONA,) No. P1300CR20081339
15	Plaintiff,) Div. 6
16	Vs.) RESPONSE TO STATE'S LATE
17	CTEVEN CARROLL DEMOCKER) DISCLOSURE IN VIOLATION
18	STEVEN CARROLL DEMOCKER,) OF ARIZONA RULE OF) CRIMINAL PROCEDURE 15.6
19	Defendant.) (72 nd SUPPLEMENTAL
20) DISCLOSURE DATED JULY 20,) 2010)
21) UNDER SEAL
22		
23	Steven DeMocker, by and through	counsel, hereby respectfully requests that the
24	Court deny the State's Motion to Extend Time for Additional Disclosure pursuant to	
	Rule 15.6(d) filed on July 20, 2010, and preclude the State from offering late disclosed	
25	evidence at trial because of the State's failure to comply with Arizona Rule of Criminal	
26	Procedure 15.6 and based on this Court's j	prior orders. This request is based on the due
27		

process clause, the Eighth Amendment and Arizona counterparts, Arizona Rules of Evidence, Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure and the following Memorandum of Points and Authorities.

I. History of the State's Failure to Comply with Rule 15 and this Court's Orders Regarding Disclosure.

The defense has repeatedly detailed the State's failures to comply with Rule 15 and the Court's orders regarding disclosure. After repeated orders precluding evidence under Rule 15 and dismissing death penalty aggravators based on disclosure violations, on April 28, the Court reminded the State that if it did not comply with Rule 15.6, it would not be permitted to use late disclosed evidence at trial. See April 8, 2010 Order, April 28, 2010 Minute Entry, May 11, 2010 Minute Entry.

Trial started on May 4, 2010 with jury selection, and opening statements took place on June 3. On June 17, Judge Lindberg became ill and was unable to continue with trial. Judge Darrow was assigned to the case on July 2.

On July 7-8, the State late disclosed over 1100 pages, six CDs, and over 11 witnesses. The Court heard argument on the Motions relating to late disclosure on July 16, 2010 and took the matters under advisement.

II. The State's Most Recent Disclosure Violations.

The State provided a Notice of additional disclosure on July 15, 2010, relating to some of the items included in the 72nd Supplemental disclosure. On July 20, the State filed a Motion requesting the Court to extend the time to provide disclosure from the 72nd Supplemental disclosure under Rule 15.6(d). The State disclosed four CDs of jail calls and 52 pages of documents as part of a 72nd Supplemental disclosure provided to the defense on July 21. Also on July 21, the State disclosed another CD of jail calls and identified it as being part of a 73rd Supplemental disclosure. No Motion has been filed for permission to use the CD from the 73rd Supplemental disclosure.

The 72nd Supplemental disclosure includes Sorenson Nonconformance and Corrective Action forms. The defense has no objection to this Sorenson disclosure.

III. The Court's Prior Orders Preclude the Late Disclosed Bank of America Trust Records and Jail Calls.

The 72nd Supplemental late disclosure includes Bank of America documents related to the Testamentary Trust for Virginia Carol Kennedy from April 23, 2009 through May 31, 2010. (Bates 26861-16911). The disclosure also includes CD's of jail calls from June and through July 15. This evidence is already precluded by prior orders of the Court and is late disclosed. The Court should therefore deny the State's Motion.

The late disclosed Bank of America records relate to the payment of Mr. DeMocker's attorney's fees. This Court has already ruled that records relating to this issue from the Testamentary Trust are precluded based on Rules 403 and 404(b). See Transcript of July 16, 2010.

The jail phone calls from June and through July 15 are also precluded by prior order of the Court which requires disclosure of jail calls within three days. This evidence is therefore already precluded by prior order of the Court. See April 13, 2010 Minute Entry.

IV. The State's Most Recent Disclosure Should Also Be Precluded Based On Arizona Rule of Criminal Procedure 15.6.

Pursuant to Arizona Rule of Criminal Procedure 15.6(b), if a party determines that additional disclosure may be forthcoming within thirty (30) days of trial, it is to notify the court and other parties "immediately" of the circumstances and when the disclosure will be available. Section (d) of the same rule provides that if a party seeks to use material that was not disclosed seven (7) days prior to trial, the party must file a motion and affidavit seeking leave of court to use the material or information. The Court may either grant or deny the motion. If the Court grants the motion, the Court may also issue sanctions. In considering whether to grant the motion, the Court is to

consider whether "the material or information could not have been discovered or disclosed earlier even with due diligence and the material or information was disclosed immediately upon its discovery."

The State has violated subsection (d) of this Pule. The State did file on affidavit

The State has violated subsection (d) of this Rule. The State did file an affidavit but did not attest in the affidavit, because it is not true, that "the material or information could not have been discovered or disclosed earlier even with due diligence and the material or information was disclosed immediately upon its discovery."

1. The State's Lack of Due Diligence on The Testamentary Trust Bank Records.

The State has been aware of the Testamentary Trust of Carol Kennedy since 2008. The State has a duty to investigate its case. If the State thought that the bank records related to the Trust were important, it should have requested them sometime in the year and a half before trial. The State had a copy of the Trust documents in November of 2009. (Bates 14081). The State's failure to request these records must lead the Court to conclude that this information could have been discovered and disclosed much earlier with any inquiry from the State. The State's disclosure of this file three months in to trial is only based on the State's own lack of due diligence. This evidence should be precluded on grounds of 15.6, if it is not precluded pursuant to the Court's prior order.

2. Precluded Jail Calls

Furthermore, the Court's order requires calls and visits to be disclosed within three days to be admissible. The State's disclosure of the June and July 1-15 jail calls on July 20, 2010 is in violation of this order and is precluded on this basis. See April 13, 2010 Minute Entry.

1 **CONCLUSION** 2 Defendant Steven DeMocker, by and through counsel, hereby requests that this 3 Court prohibit the State from offering at trial the late disclosed evidence in violation of 4 Rule 15.6 (d) and this Court's prior orders. 5 DATED this 23rd day of July, 2010. 6 7 By: 8 John M. Sears 9 P.O. Box 4080 Prescott, Arizona 86302 10 11 OSBORN MALEDON, P.A. Larry A. Hammond 12 Anne M. Chapman 2929 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2100 13 Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2793 14 Attorneys for Defendant 15 16 ORIGINAL of the foregoing hand delivered for 17 filing this 23 day of July, 2010, with: 18 Jeanne Hicks 19 Clerk of the Court Yavapai County Superior Court 20 120 S. Cortez 21 Prescott, AZ 86303 22 **COPIES** of the foregoing hand delivered this 23 this **22** day of July, 2010, to: 24 The Hon. Warren R. Darrow 25 Judge Pro Tem B

120 S. Cortez

Prescott, AZ 86303

26

27

28

Joseph C. Butner, Esq. Jeffrey Paupore, Esq.

Prescott Courthouse basket